

UNITED STATES SEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE **Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.		
09/538,455	03/30/00	ΧU			Υ	178	7-06001
_				\neg	EXAMINER		
023505		QM	102/0409				
CONLEY ROSE & TAYON, P.C.					CHAMBERS, A		
P. O. BOX 32					ART UNI	T	PAPER NUMBER
HOUSTON TX 7	77253-3267						
					3753		
					DATE MAILE	ED:	
							/09/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/538,455

Applicant(s)

Xu et al

Examiner

A. Michael Chambers

Group Art Unit 3753

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/12/01						
☑ This action is FINAL .						
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for form in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	nal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.					
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expis longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to re application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of CFR 1.136(a).	spond within the period for response will cause the					
Disposition of Claims						
	is/are pending in the application.					
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
☐ Claim(s)						
	is/are rejected.					
☐ Claim(s)						
☐ Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement.						
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Rev. The drawing(s) filed on	by the Examiner. is approved disapproved. er 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). priority documents have been contained Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). Interview Summary, PTO-413 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152						
SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE F	OLLOWING PAGES					

Art Unit: 3753

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to an amendment filed February 21, 2001. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 18-27 have been added. Claims 1-27 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- 3. Claims 1-12, and 18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Higdon et al. Note the disclosure of a "...stream switching system..." for a chromatograph including a plurality of solenoid valves 98, a sheet heater (column 4, lines 57+), and an insulated hosing (Figure 3B, for example) .Contrary to applicants' remarks, the patent to Higdon et al clearly shows a common stream channel (single inlet/multiple outlet 72) valved by a particular solenoid 98 ."At least part of the tubing being pre-heated..." by the "sheet heater" (column 4, lines 57+)(claims 1+). The solenoid actuated valves 98 clearly "vale" the "...input and output ports....between an open and closed position." (Claim 9). The reduced 'tubing size' shown in Figure 3A (claim 18) acts as a restrictor With regard to claims 19 and 20, note the plurality of imput and outport port (Figure 3A).

Art Unit: 3753

موزو

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 148 USPQ 459, that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 3753

120

- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or unobviousness.
- 7. Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higdon et al in view of Upchurch. Higdon et al disclose the claimed invention except for the recitation of a "filter" as taught by Upchurch (Figure 1). The plurality of check valves (ball valves) act as "pressure regulators. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the chromatograph system of Higdon et al to include a "cartridge filter", as taught by Upchurch in order to provide more "pure" fluid to be tested and/or processed. Further in particular note the disclosure of a filter for the "fluid streams" (column 6, lines 58+) of Higdon et al.

Conclusion

- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication communications from the Examiner should be directed to a. Michael Chambers whose telephone number is (703) 308-1016 (FAX (703) 308-7765).

Art Unit: 3753

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

amc April 7, 2001

A. MICHAEL CHAMBERS PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 3753